

REMARKS

It is noted that the Office Action states that only claims 1, 5 and 6 are pending in the application, while in actuality claims 1, 5-11 and 15 should have been designated. The last previous amendment to the claims was made in a Response mailed May 9, 2003, amending claims 1, 5 and 6, and canceling claims 2-4 and 12-14. All subsequent Office Actions (with the exception of the instant Office Action) and Responses have indicated claims 1, 5-11 and 15 were pending. Omission of claims 7-11 and 15 from consideration has not been explained by the Examiner, and clarification is accordingly respectfully requested.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 4, Line 24 should be Fig. 8, instead of Fig. 8a. On page 4, Line 25 should be Fig. 9, instead of Fig. 8b. It is noted Applicant's prior amendment mailed May 9, 2003 included an amended replacement paragraph incorporating such corrections. Reconsideration of this objection is accordingly respectfully requested. If such amendment for some reason (which has not been communicated to Applicant) may not have been entered by the Office, Applicant would consent to an Examiner's Amendment making such change if required to put the application in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA (Admitted Prior Art) in view of Iwai et al. (US Patent No. 5,446,569).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA and Iwai et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wolk et al. (US Patent 6,485,884 B2).

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of allowable dependent claim 6, thereby essentially re-writing claim 6 in independent form, and claims 5 and 6 have accordingly been cancelled. While it

is noted that pending claims 7-11 and 15 are not addressed in the Office Action as indicated above, as such claims are all dependent upon allowable claim 1, it is believed such dependent claims are also clearly now allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-9662
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.